

worldwide compatibility of cellular devices and systems. More than 260 companies belong to 3GPP, representing all levels of the cell phone industry.” *See Golden Bridge Tech., Inc. v. Motorola, Inc.*, 547 F.3d 266, 269 (5th Cir. 2008). The standard that Plaintiffs challenge was adopted in August 2008.

4. Plaintiffs also allege on “information and belief” that “AT&T has entered into formal and informal understandings with manufacturers that limit the ability of those manufacturers to provide 4G-LTE devices to smaller carriers such as [Plaintiffs] on a timely basis.” Compl. ¶ 289. The complaint does not identify the manufacturers, much less the agreements, to which the complaint may refer.

5. Plaintiffs also speculate, “[b]ased on prior knowledge and experience,” that AT&T will restrict Plaintiffs’ access to “data roaming” – that is, the ability for Plaintiffs’ wireless customers to use AT&T’s network in areas that Plaintiff does not serve – at some future time. *Id.* ¶ 311.

6. Plaintiffs did not provide Defendants with advance notice of their intention to file a massive antitrust complaint, nor did they provide a courtesy copy of the complaint to any of the Defendants at the time of filing.

7. On April 11, 2012, counsel for AT&T called counsel for Plaintiffs and requested a 30-day extension (until May 23, 2012) to respond to the complaint by answer or motion.

8. On April 12, Plaintiffs denied AT&T’s reasonable and customary request and informed AT&T that Plaintiffs would not agree to an extension beyond May 16.

DISCUSSION

10. AT&T seeks a 30-day extension of time for AT&T Mobility, LLC and a 19 day extension of time for AT&T, Inc. to respond to an extraordinarily massive antitrust complaint.²

11. There is good cause for the Court to grant the motion. To ensure a thorough response to the complaint, AT&T seeks adequate time to determine the legal basis for a potential motion to dismiss the complaint and to investigate any allegations to which an answer is required.

12. Plaintiffs' claims concerning wireless industry standards are already before the Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") – which has regulatory authority over the spectrum and device standards at issue in the complaint – and regulatory counsel for AT&T has familiarity with those matters. But the complaint also includes allegations, many of them vaguely pleaded and potentially implicating dozens if not hundreds of contracts and other arrangements.

14. Plaintiffs have no legitimate basis to oppose this request. An additional week's extension – though important to AT&T as it formulates its response to this massive and unexpected filing – will not have any material effect on the progress of this litigation.

15. Moreover, as AT&T will explain in response to Plaintiffs' April 12, 2012, Motion for Expedited Scheduling and Case Management Conference, none of the conduct of which Plaintiffs complain is recent – to the contrary, the critical allegations of the complaint involve conduct that took place in 2008. Having chosen the timing for the filing of this complaint, Plaintiffs' refusal to accommodate AT&T's customary request for a 30-day extension of time to respond is unreasonable.

² AT&T Mobility LLC was served with process on April 2, 2012. AT&T, Inc. was served with process on April 13, 2012.

CONCLUSION

16. For the foregoing reasons, the Court should grant AT&T's motion and extend the time for AT&T to plead or otherwise respond to the complaint until May 23, 2012.

Respectfully submitted,
AT&T MOBILITY LLC and AT&T, Inc.

/s/David W. Upchurch
DAVID W. UPCHURCH, MSB #10558

HOLLAND, RAY, UPCHURCH & HILLEN, P.A.
P.O.DRAWER 409
TUPELO, MS 38802-0409
TELEPHONE: 662-842-1721
FACSIMILE: 662-844-6413
dwu@hruhpa.com

*Attorneys for Defendants AT&T Mobility LLC, and
AT&T, Inc. and*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, David W. Upchurch, hereby certify that I have this day filed the foregoing Motion for Extension of Time To Respond to Antitrust Complaint with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send electronic notification of such filing to the following registered participants:

Alan W. Perry, Esq., MSB #4127
Daniel J. Mulholland, Esq., #3643
Walter H. Boone, Esq., #8651
Forman, Perry, Watkins, Krutz & Tardy, LLP
200 S. Lamar Street, Suite 100
Jackson, MS 39201-4099
Tel: 601-969-7833
Fax: 601-960-8613
aperry@fpwk.com

Charles L. McBride, Esq., MSB #8995
M. Patrick McDowell, Esq., MSB #9746
Joseph A. Sclafani, Esq., MSB #99670
Brian C. Kimball, Esq., MSB #100787
Brunini, Grantham, Grower & Hewes, PLLC
190 E. Capitol Street, Suite 100
Jackson, MS 39201-2151
Tel: 601-960-6891
Fax: 601-960-6902
cmcbride@brunini.com

Walter T. Johnson, Esq., MSB #8712
Watkins & Eager PLLC
400 East Capitol Street, Suite 300 (39201)
P.O. Box 650
Jackson, MS 39205
Tel: 601-965-1900
Fax: 601-965-1901
wjohnson@watkineager.com

Counsel for Plaintiffs Cellular South, Inc.
Corr Wireless Communications, LLC and
CellularSouth Licenses, LLC

DATED this the 16th day of April, 2012.

/s/David W. Upchurch
DAVID W. UPCHURCH